Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 11 and 12 are amended herein. No new matter has been added as a result of the amendments. The Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the above captioned Application in view of the following remarks.

102 Rejection

Claims 1-4, 8-10, 12-14 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Frantz (US Patent 6,003,070). The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as are set forth in Claims 1-4, 8-10, 12-14 and 18-20 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Frantz.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a method of using an e-mail message to control a computer resource, comprising:

> ...receiving an email message from a sender;
> recognizing a reserved command word
> within the email message; interpreting the
> email message as a command to be carried out
> on an available computer resource based on the
> reserved command word; and generating a
> command for execution on the computer resource.

Independent Claim 12 recites limitations similar to those of Claim 1. Claims 2-4, and 8-10 depend from independent Claim 1, and Claims 13-14 and 18-20 depend from

independent Claim 12 and recite further features of the embodiments of the present invention.

Frantz does not anticipate or render obvious a method of using an e-mail message to control a computer resource that includes "recognizing a reserved command word" within the e-mail message and "interpreting the email message as a command to be carried out on an available computer resource based on the reserved command word" as is recited in Claim 1 (Claim 12 contains similar limitations). Frantz only shows an e-mail system that includes an interface for equipment monitoring and control.

It should be appreciated that Frantz shows a system that generates e-mail messages that detail results which are obtained from equipment monitoring operations (error messages) and that are provided to technicians who can create other e-mail messages that are sent to an interpreter that converts the e-mail into data useable by the equipment (see column 4, lines 40-60). However, nowhere in the Frantz reference is interpreting the contents of an e-mail message as a command to be carried out on an available computer resource after the recognition of a specific type of word (the recited reserved command word) in the e-mail message taught or suggested as is recited in Claim 1 (Claim 12 contains similar limitations). Consequently, Frantz does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicant's invention as are set forth in Claims 1 and 12.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Frantz does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicant's invention as are set forth in Claims 1 and 12

and, as such, Claims 1 and 12 overcome the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-4 and 8-10 dependent on

Claim 1, and Claims 13, 14 and 18-20 dependent on Claim 12, likewise overcome the

basis for rejection as being dependent on an allowable base claim and therefore are in

condition for allowance.

103 Rejections

Claims 5, 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Frantz (US Patent 6,003,070) in view of Nielsen (US Patent 5,864,684). The Applicant

has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the

present invention as are set forth in Claims 5, 6 and 15 are neither anticipated nor

rendered obvious by Frantz.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which recites that

an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a method of using an e-mail

message to control a computer resource, comprising:

> ...receiving an email message from a sender;
> recognizing a reserved command word
> within the email message; interpreting the
> email message as a command to be carried out
> on an available computer resource based on the
> reserved command word; and generating a
> command for execution on the computer resource.

Independent Claim 12 recites limitations similar to those of Claim 1. Claims 5 and 6 depend from independent claim 1 and Claim 15 depends from independent Claim 12 and recite further features of the present invention.

Frantz does not does not anticipate or render obvious a method of using an e-mail message to control a computer resource that includes "recognizing a reserved command word" within the e-mail message and "interpreting the email message as a command to be carried out on an available computer resource based on the reserved command word" as is recited in Claim 1 from which Claims 5 and 6 depend (Claim 12 from which Claim 15 depends contains similar limitations). Frantz only shows an e-mail system that includes an interface for equipment monitoring and control.

It should be appreciated that Frantz shows a system that generates e-mail messages that detail results that are obtained from equipment monitoring operations (error messages) that are provided to technicians who can create other e-mail messages that are sent to an interpreter that converts the e-mail into data useable by the equipment (see column 4, lines 40-60). However, nowhere in the Frantz reference is interpreting the contents of an e-mail message as a command to be carried out on an available computer resource after the recognition of a specific type of word (the recited reserved command word) in the e-mail message taught or suggested as is recited in Claim 1. Consequently, Frantz does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicant's invention as are set forth in Claims 5, 6 and 15.

Nielsen does not overcome the shortcomings of Frantz. Nielsen does not anticipate or render obvious a method of using an e-mail message to control a computer resource that includes "recognizing a reserved command word" within the e-mail message and "interpreting the email message as a command to be carried out on an available computer resource" as is recited in Claim 1 from which Claims 5 and 6 depend (Claim 12 from which Claim 15 depends contains similar limitations). Nielsen only shows a method and apparatus for managing subscriptions to distribution lists. It should be appreciated however that the Nielsen reference is silent a teaching that addresses the deficiencies of Nielsen noted above. However, nowhere in the Nielsen reference is interpreting the contents of an e-mail message as a command to be carried out on an available computer resource after the recognition of a <u>specific type of word</u> (the recited reserved command word) in the e-mail message taught or suggested as is recited in Claim 1 from which Claims 5 and 6 depend (Claim 12 from which Claim 15 depends contains similar limitations). Consequently, Frantz and Nielsen, either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicant's invention as are recited in the Claims 5, 6 and 15.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Frantz and Nielsen, either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicant's invention as are set forth in Claims 1 and 12 and, as such, Claims 1 and 12 overcome the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 5 and 6 dependent on Claims 1, and Claim 15 dependent on Claim 12, likewise overcome the basis for rejection as being dependent on an allowable base claim and therefore are in condition for allowance.

Claims 7, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frantz (US Patent 6,003,070) in view of Safari Tech Books Online, PalmPilot: The Ultimate Guide, Second Edition David Pogue, hereinafter referred to as Pogue. Pogue does not overcome the shortcomings of Frantz. Pogue does not anticipate or render obvious a method of using an e-mail message to control a computer resource that includes "recognizing a reserved command word" within the e-mail message and "interpreting the email message as a command to be carried out on an available computer resource based on the reserved command word" as is recited in Claim 1 from which Claim 7 depends (Claim 12 from which Claims 16 and 17 depend contain similar limitations). It should be appreciated that the Pogue reference is silent a teaching that addresses the deficiencies of Frantz noted above. Indeed, nowhere in the Pogue reference is interpreting the contents of an e-mail message as a command to be carried out on an available computer resource after the recognition of a specific type of word (a reserved command word) in the e-mail message taught or suggested as is recited in Claim 1 from which Claim 7 depends (Claim 12 from which Claims 16 and 17 depend contain similar limitations). Consequently, Frantz in view of Pogue does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicant's invention as are set forth in Claims 7, 16 and 17.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frantz (US Patent 6,003,070) in view Nielsen (US Patent 5,864,684) and Safari Tech Books Online, PalmPilot: The Ultimate Guide, Second Edition by David Pogue, hereinafter referred to as Pogue. Nielsen and Pogue do not overcome the shortcomings of Frantz outlined above as Frantz in view of Nielsen and Pogue does not anticipate or render

obvious a method of using an e-mail message to control a computer resource that includes "recognizing a reserved command word" within the e-mail message and "interpreting the email message as a command to be carried out on an available computer resource based on the reserved command word" as is recited in Claim 11. It should be appreciated that the Nielsen and Pogue references are silent a teaching that addresses the noted deficiencies of Frantz. Indeed, nowhere in the Nielsen or Pogue reference is interpreting the contents of an e-mail message as a command to be carried out on an available computer resource after the recognition of a specific type of word (a reserved command word) in the e-mail message taught or suggested as is recited in Claim 11. Consequently, Frantz in view of Nielsen and Pogue does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiment of the Applicant's invention as is set forth in Claim 11.

SUMMARY

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Reginald A. Ratliff at (408) 938–9060.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO
& HAO LLP

Dated: _3/30_ , 2005

Reginald A. Ratliff
Registration No.: 48,098
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060